

issue in a magistrate judge's report, a party must object to the finding or recommendation on that issue with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection." Martin v. Duffy, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017) (quotation omitted); see United States v. Midgette, 478 F.3d 616, 622 (4th Cir. 2007).

Morgan did not object to the M&R; therefore, the court reviews for clear error. See Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315. The court has reviewed the M&R and the record. There is no clear error on the face of the record. See id. The court adopts the conclusions in the M&R [D.E. 5].

On January 12, 2024, Morgan paid the \$405.00 filing fee.

In sum, the court ADOPTS the conclusions in the M&R [D.E. 5] and DISMISSES AS MOOT plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis [D.E. 2] .

SO ORDERED. This 5 day of March, 2024.



JAMES C. DEVER III
United States District Judge